

The impact to these four tribes was based on the assumption that the Hudson share of the market would be between 5 percent and 10 percent greater than that projected by the BIA.

Shakopee Chairman Stanley Crooks said that he was not particularly concerned with the economic impact of a Hudson casino. He stated that “we’re close enough to be [affected],” although “[we] wouldn’t be [affected] as much as other tribes.”<sup>181</sup> Crooks was worried, however, that the politicians would have to allow slot machines in bars, if the Hudson proposal were approved. This development, in turn, would hurt the tribe economically.

The Minnesota tribe located closest to Hudson – Prairie Island – did not participate in the Peat Marwick analysis. Rather, they chose to remain publicly neutral. Although the Peat Marwick analysis cited Prairie Island’s situation to make its “detriment” argument, the analysis was submitted only on behalf of MIGA and three other tribes – the Mille Lacs, the Shakopee, and the St. Croix – and MIGA absorbed Prairie Island’s share of the bill.

Moreover, when offered the opportunity to retain O’Connor & Hannan jointly with the St. Croix to lobby against the Hudson proposal, Prairie Island declined. The evidence suggests the tribe chose to take a neutral posture because in the spring and summer of 1995 it also was trying to obtain an off-reservation parcel of land near the Twin Cities market to establish a casino.

Though the deadline for submitting additional materials was Sunday, April 30, Skibine permitted some late comments. By letter dated April 30, the St. Croix Chippewa tribe sent Skibine a Coopers & Lybrand report projecting a 15 percent loss of customers if a casino were to open in Hudson. By letter dated Monday, May 1, a tribal attorney for the Ho-Chunk Nation

---

<sup>181</sup>Grand Jury Testimony of Stanley Crooks, April 21, 1999, at 8 (hereinafter “S. Crooks G.J. Test., April 21, 1999”).